REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1-28 currently stand rejected. Claims 1 and 15 have been amended. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1-28 and consideration of the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0157646 (Addagatla), in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0070230 (Das). Independent claim 15 contains limitations similar to those of independent claim 1 and was rejected for reasons similar to those for claim 1. Thus, the following discussion applies equally to claims 1 and 15. The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 1 and 15 have been amended to clarify the operation of the end communication device. The end communication device is configured to *receive a call request message for a call*, and to *transmit the call request message over the packet network*. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at least at page 19, line 21, and at page 21, lines 9-10, thus no new matter has been added to the application.

Further, the end communication device is configured to receive the response message and perform call blocking on *call requests received by the end communication device* to be handled by the call processing system responsive to the response message. Support for this amendment may be found in the specification at least at page 19, lines 21-23, and at page 21, line 18 – page 22, line 19, thus no new matter has been added to the application.

Claim 1 currently recites, in part, an end communication device that receives a call request message for a call, and transmits the call request message to a call processing system that includes priority information for the call. The call processing system processes the call request message to determine if the call request message is for a high priority call. Upon determining that the call request message is not for a high priority call, the call processing system sends a response message to the end communication device indicating a state of congestion in the call processing system responsive to the

response message. The end communication device then performs call blocking on call requests received by the end communication device to be handled by the call processing system responsive to the response message. Claim 15 contains limitations similar to those of claim 1.

The end communication device is illustrated by line gateway 504 in Figures 5A and 5B, and by line gateway 628 in Figure 6. Notice that line gateway 504 in Figure 5A receives call setup messages from phones 501, 502, and 503. Line gateway 628 in Figure 6 receives call setup messages from room phones 621, front desk phones 622, courtesy phones 623, and security phones 624. The end communication device transmits call request messages (including priority information for the call) to a call processing system. When the call processing system is in a state of congestion, and receives a call request for other than a high priority call, it sends a response message to the end communication device. The end communication device then performs call blocking on *call requests received by the end communication device* to be handled by the call processing system responsive to the response message.

In contrast, Addagatla and Das, separately and in combination, fail to teach an end communication device that both *receives* and *transmits* call request messages to a call processing system. Addagatla and Das, separately and in combination, further fail to teach a call processing system transmitting a response message to an end communication device indicating a state of congestion in the call processing system, and an end communication device that performs call blocking on *call requests received by the end communication device* to be handled by the call processing system responsive to the response message.

In particular, Addagatla does not teach an end communication device that *receives* and *transmits* call request messages to a call processing system, and also performs call blocking on *call requests received by the end communication device* to be handled by the call processing system. The UDP throttle 608 taught by Addagatla does not act to block call requests that it receives in response to a response message from the call processing system indicating congestion. The UDP throttle is used to control potential bandwidth congestion in a packet system, and does not selectively block call requests to the call processing system. Addagatla's UDP throttle continues to send call requests to the call

processing system, but simply controls the rate at which call requests are sent. In contrast, claims 1 and 15 require the end communication device to block call requests responsive to a response message from the call processing system indicating a state of congestion.

Similar to Addagatla, Das does not disclose an end communication device that performs call blocking on *call requests received by the end communication device* to be handled by the call processing system. Das does not teach any type of end communication device that both *receives* and *transmits* call requests to a call processing system, and that also performs call blocking on *call requests* received by the end communication device. Notice that Das explicitly states in paragraph [[0024]] that, "There is no per-call interaction between the soft-switch 112 and the CAM 126, or per-call computations." Without per-call computations, the soft-switch 112 from Das is incapable of performing as the end communication device of claims 1 and 15. Thus Das does not disclose a device capable of receiving and transmitting call requests, and also capable of performing call blocking on call requests in response to a response message from a call processing system.

Thus, even the combination of Addagatla and Das fails to teach an end communication device that both *receives* and *transmits* call request messages to a call processing system, and that also performs call blocking on *call requests received by the end communication device* to be handled by the call processing system responsive to the response message. Claims 1 and 15 are therefore patentable over the cited references.

Based on the foregoing comments, the Applicant contends that claims 1 and 15 are allowable in view of the cited references, and such indication is respectfully requested. Claims 2-14 depend from independent claim 1, and claims 16-28 depend from independent claim 15, thus incorporating the limitations of their corresponding independent claims. Therefore, the Applicant asserts that claims 2-14 and 16-28 are allowable for at least the reasons given above in support of independent claims 1 and 15, and such indication is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above remarks, the Applicant submits that the claims in their present form are allowable. Additional reasons in support of patentability exist, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of clarity and brevity. The Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the claims.

The Applicant believes no fees are due with respect to this filing. However, should the Office determine fees are necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 210765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 02/11/2008

/Leslie P. Gehman/

SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER
Leslie P. Gehman, Reg. No. 45,624
Setter Roche LLP
Telephone: (720) 562-2280
E-mail: les@setterroche.com

Correspondence address:

CUSTOMER NO. 28004
Attn: Melissa A. Jobe
Sprint Law Department
6450 Sprint Parkway
Mailstop: KSOPHN0312-3A461
Overland Park, KS 66251